



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tries with ever-increasing frequency in which those responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs complain of the press making their work so difficult. As long ago as 1892 Graf Kalnicky, Austro-Hungarian Minister, recommended peace societies to direct their attention toward the daily press and the news appearing in its columns. Graf Kalnicky said that "the nerves of the reading public, and even passions political and national in their nature, were affected by the press to such an extent as often to cause extreme tension, which the government had much ado to allay. If," he continued, "peace congresses are concerned with the question of peace, I would recommend them to bear this fact constantly in mind, and to exert their influence for good in every country where such things occur."

(To be continued)

Armaments—Calling a Halt.

The *Friend*, London, England, in its issue for December 5, contains the following illuminating editorial:

"This council views with grave anxiety the continued growth in armaments, which, unless checked, must inevitably lead to an increase in taxation. The council expresses its most earnest hope that, in view of the conspicuous improvement in the relations between Great Britain and foreign powers, no opportunity will be lost in continuing to press forward friendly negotiations with these powers in order that an end may be put to suspicion and misunderstanding, the most fruitful causes of the disastrous rivalry in armaments between the nations of Europe. Further, the council is of opinion that the right of capture of private property at sea in time of war should be abolished, and also that floating mines should be prohibited, and that the Government be urged to support both these proposals at the next Hague Conference."

"That the foregoing resolution should be unanimously carried last week by the largest gathering of delegates at the National Liberal Federation for the past ten years is ground for satisfaction; it drew forth a fervent 'Thank God!' from the president, Sir John Brunner. In his able speech in moving the resolution J. Allen Baker, M. P., remarked that its terms were mild and restrained compared with the strong feeling existing among the rank and file of Liberals in the country. Not only is there anxiety, but there is positive alarm at the proposals foreshadowed in the recent speech of the First Lord of the Admiralty. Mr. Baker touched the weakest spot in the government's position when he referred to the 'wicked and senseless naval scare of 1909.' Admittedly the country, from the government downwards, was gravely misled at that time respecting German naval policy. We now know the inner history of that scare, and something of the part that firms interested in the production of armaments played therein. But the lesson is being very slowly learned. 'What a year ago was loudly proclaimed as an ample security against the next strongest power must now become, instead of the 60 per cent then advocated, an 80 per cent, or even a 100 per cent, superiority.' Along with this piling up of naval expenditure we continue to be assured of the growingly friendly relations between ourselves and Germany, such as have not prevailed between us for years. Profession and practice do not harmonize. We agree with J. Allen Baker, that a 'situation of great gravity affecting the welfare of the nation has arisen, and if any in-

crease beyond that arising from the programs already sanctioned by the House of Commons is proposed it should be refused. The nation was never in a safer position, either from its material strength or through its friendliness with other great powers. There is none that would dream of attacking us unless provoked beyond endurance. On the other hand, they all appreciate our good offices during the war in the Balkans, and desire our friendship.'

"How can this extravagance be arrested? J. Allen Baker suggested two ways toward amendment: (1) in accord with the above resolution, the relinquishment of the right of the capture of private property at sea in time of war, and (2) a strong personal lead from the midst of a powerful nation. The right of capture, he pointed out, was of no real value to us, inasmuch as under the present international law German commerce could easily escape destruction by being transferred by railway to neutral ports, and then conveyed in neutral bottoms. Thus in a war with Germany we should at the best only be able to bring an indirect and very slight pressure on them by exercising the right of capture, while with our enormous overseas commerce we have much more to gain than to lose by abandoning this right. Recalling the Premier's Guildhall question whether the time has not come for statesmen and men of business to take counsel together to secure a saner and more fruitful appropriation of the common resources of mankind, J. Allen Baker pointed out that some country must take the initiative and make the proposals, which must find expression from the country's leader. That this is the country to which the others would listen, and that our Prime Minister is the man to make the proposals, he said, is certain. 'Surely the hour has come.' 'If such a step were taken with tact, wisdom, courage, and true statesmanship, it would be welcomed by many, if not all, the great nations, and sooner or later would contribute to the lasting peace and prosperity of the empire and the world.'"

Book Notices.

CONSULAR TREATY RIGHTS AND COMMENTS ON THE "MOST FAVORED NATION" CLAUSE. By Ernest Ludwig, Consul for Austria-Hungary, at Cleveland, Ohio. The New Werner Co., Akron, Ohio, 1913. 239 pages. Price, \$4.50.

This book would be more accurately entitled if it bore the inscription "Consular treaty rights with regard to the administration of the estates of deceased aliens." The volume is, in fact, a brief on the point that consuls of foreign countries in the United States today have the right to "intervene" in the settlement of estates of deceased citizens of their respective countries, to take possession of the property and receive appointment as administrators, or to designate the administrators to be appointed by the courts. To sustain his thesis the author devotes himself to citing State and Federal cases, and, in the light thereof, explaining the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Rocca vs. Thompson* (223 U. S., 317) to show its inapplicability to present conditions.

The remainder of the volume contains suggestive notes upon the most-favored nation clause,—both the